UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,356	07/12/2001	Graham P. Allaway	43966-CB/JPW/SHS	2885

7590 07/01/2003

John P. White
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER	
PARKIN, JEFFREY S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1648	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,356	ALLAWAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 July 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3, 4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Detailed Office Action

Status of the Claims

1. Acknowledgement is hereby made of receipt and entry of the preliminary amendment filed 12 July, 2001, wherein claims 1-6 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 7-12 submitted. Claims 7-12 are currently under examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements filed 20 August, and 13 December, 2002, have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. *In re Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 U.S.P.Q. 323 (C.C.P.A. 1981). *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 U.S.P.Q. 90 (C.C.P.A. 1976). The claims are directed toward methods of inhibiting macrophage-tropic HIV-1 fusion to a $CD4^+$ cell target through the administration of an agent or compound that is specific only for macrophage-tropic isolates or methods of inhibiting T-cell tropic HIV-1 fusion to a

$CD4^+$ cell target through the administration of an agent or compound that is specific only for T-cell tropic isolates. Thus, in order to practice the claimed invention, the skilled artisan would require macrophage-tropic-specific and T-cell-tropic-specific inhibitory compounds.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc., v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1116. The issue raised in this application is whether the original application provides adequate support for the broadly claimed genus of compounds that are required to practice the claimed methodology. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described where an invention is described solely in terms of a method of its making coupled with its function and there is no described or art-recognized correlation or relationship between the structure of the invention and its function. A biomolecule sequence described only by functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the biomolecule of interest. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1993). *In re Deuel*, 51 F.3d 1552, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1210 (Fed. Cir. 1995). A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one

skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1995). The court noted in this decision that a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not reasonably lead those skilled in the art to any particular species.

An applicant may show possession of an invention by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that are sufficiently detailed to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention as a whole. An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics. For some biomolecules, examples of identifying characteristics include a nucleotide or amino acid sequence, chemical structure, binding affinity, binding specificity, and molecular weight. The written description requirement may be satisfied through disclosure of function and minimal structure when there is a well-established correlation between structure and function. Without such a correlation, the capability to recognize or understand the structure form the mere recitation of function and minimal structure is highly unlikely. In the latter case, disclosure of function alone is little more than a wish for possession; it does not satisfy the written description requirement. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 U.S.P.Q.2d 1398, 1404, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 U.S.P.Q. 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir.

1984). Factors to be considered in determining whether there is sufficient evidence of possession include the level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention.

The molecular determinants modulating HIV-1 envelope fusion are complex (O'Brien *et al.*, 1990). The description provides a generic screening assay for identifying putative macrophage-tropic-specific or T-cell-tropic-specific inhibitors. However, this screening assay fails to provide any guidance pertaining to the structure of those compounds that can reasonably be expected to inhibit viral cell fusion. The skilled artisan cannot reasonably predict the structure of any given inhibitor. Moreover, the disclosure fails to provide sufficient guidance pertaining to this point. While the disclosure describes the isolation of four Mabs (PA-3, PA-5, PA-6, and PA-7) that are capable of inhibiting envelope-mediated viral cell fusion, none of these compounds were specific to either macrophage-tropic or T-cell-tropic isolates. The disclosure clearly stated (p. 60, first paragraph) that "The culture supernatants from hybridomas PA-3, PA-5, PA-6 and PA-7 inhibited fusion between HeLa-env_{JR-FL} and PM1 cells in the RET assay, and also inhibited fusion between HeLa-env_{LAI} cells and certain CD4+ target cells (Table 3)." Thus, the disclosure fails to identify any suitable agents with the desired properties. Thus, upon perusal of the disclosure, the skilled artisan would reasonably conclude that applicants were not in possession of a reasonable number of macrophage-tropic- or T-cell-tropic-specific inhibitory agents. Moreover, nothing in the disclosure points the skilled artisan toward any particular class of agents.

5. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably enable any person

skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claimed invention is directed toward methods of inhibiting macrophage-tropic HIV-1 fusion to a $CD4^+$ cell target through the administration of an agent or compound that is specific only for macrophage-tropic isolates or methods of inhibiting T-cell tropic HIV-1 fusion to a $CD4^+$ cell target through the administration of an agent or compound that is specific only for T-cell tropic isolates.

The legal considerations that govern enablement determinations pertaining to undue experimentation are disclosed in *In re Wands*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (C.A.F.C. 1988) and *Ex parte Forman* 230 U.S.P.Q. 546 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. Int., 1986). The courts concluded that several factual inquiries should be considered when making such assessments including the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims. *In re Rainer*, 52 C.C.P.A. 1593, 347 F.2d 574, 146 U.S.P.Q. 218 (1965). The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to a number of these considerations as follows: 1) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the molecular determinants that are specific to macrophage-tropic envelope-mediated cell fusion and T-cell-tropic envelope-mediated cell fusion. Rational drug development requires a knowledge of the molecular determinants that are specific to each type of virus. This would provide a starting point for the skilled artisan to begin testing compounds in the hope of identifying something useful. However, the disclosure fails to provide any guidance pertaining to this consideration. Moreover, the disclosure fails to provide a reproducible method for identifying putative

inhibitors. While a fusion assay is provided in the specification, the skilled artisan cannot reasonably predict which compounds or agents will function in the desired manner.

2) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the structural requirements of any given inhibitor. The disclosure fails to describe any particular class of compounds that can reasonably be expected to function in the desired manner. Absent any guidance concerning the structure of said compounds, an undue invitation to further experimentation has been extended to the skilled artisan.

3) The claims are of considerable breadth and encompass an inordinate number of compounds. However, as noted *supra*, the disclosure fails to provide sufficient guidance pertaining to the molecular determinants modulating macrophage-tropic-specific and T-cell-tropic-specific fusion interactions. The disclosure also fails to provide any guidance pertaining to the structure of any given inhibitory agent. Thus, the specification clearly fails to support the breadth of the claimed invention.

4) The disclosure fails to provide any working embodiments. Considering the breadth of the claimed invention, a representative number of working embodiments would be required. However, the specification is deficient in this regard. Moreover, the disclosure clearly illustrates the problems associated with identifying specific inhibitors wherein it was reported (p. 60, first paragraph) that "The culture supernatants from hybridomas PA-3, PA-5, PA-6 and PA-7 inhibited fusion between HeLa-env_{JR-FL} and PM1 cells in the RET assay, and also inhibited fusion between HeLa-env_{LAI} cells and certain CD4+ target cells (Table 3)."

Therefore, when all the aforementioned factors are considered *in toto*, it would clearly require undue experimentation from the skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention.

Correspondence

6. Correspondence related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Official communications should be directed toward one of the following Group 1600 fax numbers: (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014. Informal communications may be submitted directly to the Examiner through the following fax number: (703) 308-4426. Applicants are encouraged to notify the Examiner prior to the submission of such documents to facilitate their expeditious processing and entry.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-2227. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, Laurie Scheiner or James Housel, can be reached at (703) 308-1122 or (703) 308-4027, respectively. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Respectfully,

Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1648

12 June, 2003